

Clerk's stamp:

COURT FILE NUMBER 2301-07385

COURT COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE CALGARY

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, RSC 1985, c C-36, as amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF CYXTERA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
CYXTERA CANADA, LLC, CYXTERA COMMUNICATIONS
CANADA, ULC and CYXTERA CANADA TRS, ULC

APPLICANT CYXTERA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., CYXTERA CANADA, LLC,
CYXTERA COMMUNICATIONS CANADA, ULC and CYXTERA
CANADA TRS, ULC

DOCUMENT **BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE FOREIGN
REPRESENTATIVE**

ADDRESS FOR
SERVICE AND
CONTACT
INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING
THIS DOCUMENT

Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP
421 7 Ave SW Suite 1600
Calgary, AB T2P 4K9
**Attn: Tom Cumming/Sam Gabor/and
Stephen Kroeger**
Ph. 1 403 298 1946
File No.: A171290

**APPLICATION BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE D. B. NIXON
JANUARY 25, 2024 AT 2:00 PM ON THE COMMERCIAL LIST**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

TAB	AUTHORITY
1.	<i>Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act</i> , R.S.C. 1985
2.	<i>Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re</i> , 2000 CanLII 22482 (ON SC)
3.	<i>MtGox Co., Ltd (Re)</i> , 2014 ONSC 5811
4.	<i>Hollander Sleep Products, LLC (Re)</i> , 2019 ONSC 3238
5.	<i>Purdue Pharma L.P., Re</i> , 2019 ONSC 7042
6.	<i>Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)</i> , 2017 ONSC 673

TAB 1

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Interpretation [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 45

s 45.

Currency

45.

45(1) Definitions

The following definitions apply in this Part.

"foreign court" means a judicial or other authority competent to control or supervise a foreign proceeding. ("*tribunal étranger*")

"foreign main proceeding" means a foreign proceeding in a jurisdiction where the debtor company has the centre of its main interests. ("*principale*")

"foreign non-main proceeding" means a foreign proceeding, other than a foreign main proceeding. ("*secondaire*")

"foreign proceeding" means a judicial or an administrative proceeding, including an interim proceeding, in a jurisdiction outside Canada dealing with creditors' collective interests generally under any law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency in which a debtor company's business and financial affairs are subject to control or supervision by a foreign court for the purpose of reorganization. ("*instance étrangère*")

"foreign representative" means a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, who is authorized, in a foreign proceeding respect of a debtor company, to

- (a) monitor the debtor company's business and financial affairs for the purpose of reorganization; or
- (b) act as a representative in respect of the foreign proceeding.

("représentant étranger")

45(2) Centre of debtor company's main interests

For the purposes of this Part, in the absence of proof to the contrary, a debtor company's registered office is deemed to be the centre of its main interests.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to June 20, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Purpose [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 44

s 44. Purpose

Currency

44.Purpose

The purpose of this Part is to provide mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvencies and to promote

- (a) cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities in Canada with those of foreign jurisdictions in cases of cross-border insolvencies;
- (b) greater legal certainty for trade and investment;
- (c) the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects the interests of creditors and other interested persons, and those of debtor companies;
- (d) the protection and the maximization of the value of debtor company's property; and
- (e) the rescue of financially troubled businesses to protect investment and preserve employment.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to June 20, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Obligations [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 52

s 52.

Currency

52.

52(1) Cooperation — court

If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

52(2) Cooperation — other authorities in Canada

If any proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company and an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made in respect of the debtor company, every person who exercises powers or performs duties and functions under the proceedings under this Act shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

52(3) Forms of cooperation

For the purpose of this section, cooperation may be provided by any appropriate means, including

- (a) the appointment of a person to act at the direction of the court;
- (b) the communication of information by any means considered appropriate by the court;
- (c) the coordination of the administration and supervision of the debtor company's assets and affairs;
- (d) the approval or implementation by courts of agreements concerning the coordination of proceedings; and
- (e) the coordination of concurrent proceedings regarding the same debtor company.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 80

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to June 20, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Miscellaneous Provisions [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 61

s 61.

Currency

61.

61(1) Court not prevented from applying certain rules

Nothing in this Part prevents the court, on the application of a foreign representative or any other interested person, from applying any legal or equitable rules governing the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and assistance to foreign representatives that are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

61(2) Public policy exception

Nothing in this Part prevents the court from refusing to do something that would be contrary to public policy.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 81

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to June 20, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Recognition of Foreign Proceeding [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 49

s 49.

Currency

49.

49(1) Other orders

If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court may, on application by the foreign representative who applied for the order, if the court is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of a creditor or creditors, make any order that it considers appropriate, including an order

- (a) if the foreign proceeding is a foreign non-main proceeding, referred to in [subsection 48\(1\)](#);
- (b) respecting the examination of witnesses, the taking of evidence or the delivery of information concerning the debtor company's property, business and financial affairs, debts, liabilities and obligations; and
- (c) authorizing the foreign representative to monitor the debtor company's business and financial affairs in Canada for the purpose of reorganization.

49(2) Restriction

If any proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of the debtor company at the time an order recognizing the foreign proceeding is made, an order made under subsection (1) must be consistent with any order that may be made in any proceedings under this Act.

49(3) Application of this and other Acts

The making of an order under paragraph (1)(a) does not preclude the commencement or the continuation of proceedings under this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* in respect of the debtor company.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to June 20, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Recognition of Foreign Proceeding [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 50

s 50. Terms and conditions of orders

Currency

50. Terms and conditions of orders

An order under this Part may be made on any terms and conditions that the court considers appropriate in the circumstances.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to June 20, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Obligations [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 52

s 52.

Currency

52.

52(1) Cooperation — court

If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

52(2) Cooperation — other authorities in Canada

If any proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company and an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made in respect of the debtor company, every person who exercises powers or performs duties and functions under the proceedings under this Act shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

52(3) Forms of cooperation

For the purpose of this section, cooperation may be provided by any appropriate means, including

- (a) the appointment of a person to act at the direction of the court;
- (b) the communication of information by any means considered appropriate by the court;
- (c) the coordination of the administration and supervision of the debtor company's assets and affairs;
- (d) the approval or implementation by courts of agreements concerning the coordination of proceedings; and
- (e) the coordination of concurrent proceedings regarding the same debtor company.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 80

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to June 20, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Miscellaneous Provisions [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 61

s 61.

Currency

61.

61(1) Court not prevented from applying certain rules

Nothing in this Part prevents the court, on the application of a foreign representative or any other interested person, from applying any legal or equitable rules governing the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and assistance to foreign representatives that are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

61(2) Public policy exception

Nothing in this Part prevents the court from refusing to do something that would be contrary to public policy.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 81

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to June 20, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:20 (September 27, 2023)

TAB 2

**Ontario Supreme Court
Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.,
Date: 2000-02-25**

In the Matter of Section 18.6 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985,
c. C-36, as amended

In the Matter of Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List] Farley J.

Heard: February 25, 2000

Judgment: February 25, 2000

Docket: 00-CL-3667

Derrick Toy, for Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.

Paul Macdonald, for Citibank North America Inc., Lenders under the Post-Petition Credit Agreement.

Farley J.:

[1] I have had the opportunity to reflect on this matter which involves an aspect of the recent amendments to the insolvency legislation of Canada, which amendments have not yet been otherwise dealt with as to their substance. The applicant, Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. ("BW Canada"), a solvent company, has applied for an interim order under s. 18.6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"):

- (a) that the proceedings commenced by BW Canada's parent U.S. corporation and certain other U.S. related corporations (collectively "BWUS") for protection under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code in connection with mass asbestos claims before the U.S. Bankruptcy Court be recognized as a "foreign proceeding" for the purposes of s. 18.6;
- (b) that BW Canada be declared a company which is entitled to avail itself of the provisions of s. 18.6;
- (c) that there be a stay against suits and enforcements until May 1, 2000 (or such later date as the Court may order) as to asbestos related proceedings against BW Canada, its property and its directors;

been increased by the financial assistance given by the BW Canada guarantee of BWUS' obligations.

[20] To date the overwhelming thrust of the asbestos related litigation has been focussed in the U.S. In contradistinction BW Canada has not in essence been involved in asbestos litigation to date. The 1994 amendments to the U.S. Bankruptcy Code have provided a specific regime which is designed to deal with the mass tort claims (which number in the hundreds of thousands of claims in the U.S.) which appear to be endemic in the U.S. litigation arena involving asbestos related claims as well as other types of mass torts. This Court's assistance however is being sought to stay asbestos related claims against BW Canada with a view to this stay facilitating an environment in which a global solution may be worked out within the context of the Chapter 11 proceedings trust.

[21] In my view, s. 18.6(3) and (4) permit BW Canada to apply to this Court for such a stay and other appropriate relief. Relying upon the existing law on the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and proceedings, the principles and practicalities discussed and illustrated in the Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat and the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvencies and inherent jurisdiction, all as discussed above, I would think that the following may be of assistance in advancing guidelines as to how s. 18.6 should be applied. I do not intend the factors listed below to be exclusive or exhaustive but merely an initial attempt to provide guidance:

(a) The recognition of comity and cooperation between the courts of various jurisdictions are to be encouraged.

(b) Respect should be accorded to the overall thrust of foreign bankruptcy and insolvency legislation in any analysis, unless in substance generally it is so different from the bankruptcy and insolvency law of Canada or perhaps because the legal process that generates the foreign order diverges radically from the process here in Canada.

(c) All stakeholders are to be treated equitably, and to the extent reasonably possible, common or like stakeholders are to be treated equally, regardless of the jurisdiction in which they reside.

(d) The enterprise is to be permitted to implement a plan so as to reorganize as a global unit, especially where there is an established interdependence on a transnational basis

of the enterprise and to the extent reasonably practicable, one jurisdiction should take charge of the principal administration of the enterprise's reorganization, where such principal type approach will facilitate a potential reorganization and which respects the claims of the stakeholders and does not inappropriately detract from the net benefits which may be available from alternative approaches.

(e) The role of the court and the extent of the jurisdiction it exercises will vary on a case by case basis and depend to a significant degree upon the court's nexus to that enterprise; in considering the appropriate level of its involvement, the court would consider:

(i) the location of the debtor's principal operations, undertaking and assets;

(ii) the location of the debtor's stakeholders;

(iii) the development of the law in each jurisdiction to address the specific problems of the debtor and the enterprise;

(iv) the substantive and procedural law which may be applied so that the aspect of undue prejudice may be analyzed;

(v) such other factors as may be appropriate in the instant circumstances.

(f) Where one jurisdiction has an ancillary role,

(i) the court in the ancillary jurisdiction should be provided with information on an ongoing basis and be kept apprised of developments in respect of that debtor's reorganizational efforts in the foreign jurisdiction;

(ii) stakeholders in the ancillary jurisdiction should be afforded appropriate access to the proceedings in the principal jurisdiction.

(g) As effective notice as is reasonably practicable in the circumstances should be given to all affected stakeholders, with an opportunity for such stakeholders to come back into the court to review the granted order with a view, if thought desirable, to rescind or vary the granted order or to obtain any other appropriate relief in the circumstances.

[22] Taking these factors into consideration, and with the determination that the Chapter 11 proceedings are a "foreign proceeding" within the meaning of s. 18.6 of the CCAA and that it is appropriate to declare that BW Canada is entitled to avail itself of the provisions of s. 18.6, I would also grant the following relief. There is to be a stay against suits and enforcement as

TAB 3

2014 ONSC 5811

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

MtGox Co., Re

2014 CarswellOnt 13871, 2014 ONSC 5811, 122 O.R. (3d) 465, 20 C.B.R. (6th) 307, 245 A.C.W.S. (3d) 280

In the Matter of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1992, C. 27, S.2, as Amended

In the Matter of MtGox Co., Ltd., the Bankrupt in a Proceeding under Japan's
Bankruptcy Act before the Tokyo District Court Twentieth Civil Division

Application of Nobuaki Kobayashi, in his capacity as the bankruptcy Trustee of MtGox Co., Ltd. Pursuant to
Japan's Bankruptcy Act Under Part XIII of The Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (Cross-Border Insolvencies)

Newbould J.

Heard: October 3, 2014

Judgment: October 6, 2014

Docket: CV-14-10709-00CL

Counsel: Margaret R. Sims for Applicant

Subject: Insolvency; International

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Bankruptcy and insolvency jurisdiction — Jurisdiction of courts — Jurisdiction of Bankruptcy Court — Territorial jurisdiction — Foreign bankruptcies

M Co. was Japanese corporation that operated online exchange for purchase and sale of bitcoins, a form of digital currency — M Co. was located and headquartered in Tokyo, Japan — In February 2014, M Co. halted all bitcoin withdrawals by its customers after it was subject to a massive theft — These events caused M Co. to become insolvent, and eventually led to bankruptcy proceeding in Japan — M Co. was subsequently named as defendant in pending class action filed in Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Ontario Court) — Trustee of M Co. applied to Ontario Court for initial recognition order recognizing bankruptcy proceeding commenced in Japan, declaring trustee as foreign representative, and staying all proceedings against M Co. — Application granted — Japan bankruptcy proceeding was judicial proceeding dealing with creditors' collective interests generally under Japan Bankruptcy Act (JPA), in which M Co.'s property was subject to supervision by Tokyo District Court — Trustee had authority pursuant to JPA and order of Tokyo District Court to administer M Co.'s property and affairs and to act as foreign representative — Accordingly, Japan bankruptcy proceeding constituted "foreign proceeding" and trustee constituted "foreign representative" under [s. 268\(1\) of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act \(BIA\)](#) — M Co.'s centre of its main interests was its registered head office in Japan — Accordingly, Japan bankruptcy proceeding was foreign main proceeding, entitling M Co. to automatic stay under [s. 271\(1\) of BIA](#).

APPLICATION by bankruptcy trustee for initial recognition order pursuant to Part XIII of *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

Newbould J.:

1 Nobuaki Kobayashi, in his capacity as the bankruptcy trustee of MtGox Co., Ltd. applied on October 3, 2014 for an initial recognition order pursuant to Part XIII (section 267 to 284) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1992, c. 27, s.2, as amended ("[BIA](#)");

(a) declaring and recognizing the bankruptcy proceedings commenced in respect of MtGox pursuant to the Bankruptcy Act of Japan, Act No. 75 of June 2, 2004 before the Tokyo District Court, Twentieth Civil Division as a foreign main proceeding for the purposes of [section 270 of the BIA](#);

(b) declaring that the Trustee is a foreign representative pursuant to [section 268\(1\) of the BIA](#), and is entitled to bring this application pursuant to [section 269 of the BIA](#); and

(c) staying and enjoining any claims, rights, liens or proceedings against or in respect of MtGox and the property of MtGox.

2 I concluded at the hearing that the relief sought should be granted, for reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

3 MtGox is a Japanese corporation formed in 2011. It is, and always has been, located and headquartered in Tokyo, Japan. From April 2012 to February 2014, its business was the operation of an online exchange for the purchase and sale of bitcoins through its website located at <http://www.mtgox.com>. Bitcoins are a form of digital currency. At one time, the MtGox Exchange was reported to be the largest online bitcoin exchange in the world.

4 On or about February 10, 2014, MtGox halted all bitcoin withdrawals by its customers after it was subject to what appears to have been a massive theft or disappearance of bitcoins held by it. MtGox suspended all trading on or about February 24, 2014 after it was discovered that approximately 850,000 bitcoins were missing. These events caused, among other things, MtGox to become insolvent and ultimately led to the Japan bankruptcy proceeding.

5 On February 28, 2014, MtGox filed a petition for the commencement of a civil rehabilitation proceeding in the Tokyo Court pursuant to Article 21(1) of the Japan Civil Rehabilitation Act (JCRA), reporting that it had lost almost 850,000 bitcoins. A civil rehabilitation proceeding under the JCRA is analogous to a restructuring proceeding in Canada pursuant to the [BIA](#) or the CCAA.

6 Following the filing of the Japan civil rehabilitation petition, MtGox commenced an investigation with regard to the circumstances that led to the Japan civil rehabilitation. However, by mid-April, 2014, the Tokyo Court decided to dismiss the Japan civil rehabilitation petition pursuant to Article 25(3) of the JCRA, recognizing that under the circumstances it would be very difficult for MtGox to successfully prepare and obtain approval of a rehabilitation plan or otherwise successfully carry out the Japan civil rehabilitation.

7 On April 24, 2014, the Tokyo Court entered the Japan bankruptcy order, formally commencing MtGox's Japan bankruptcy proceeding and appointing the applicant as bankruptcy trustee.

8 MtGox has approximately 120,000 customers who had a bitcoin or fiat currency balance in their accounts as of the date of the Japan petition. The customers live in approximately 175 countries around the world.

9 MtGox has been named as a defendant in a pending class action filed in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. The notice of action and statement of claim were provided to the Trustee under the Hague Convention on August 29, 2014.

Applicable law

10 Various theories as to how multi-national bankruptcies should be dealt with have long existed. Historically many countries adopted a territorialism approach under which insolvency proceedings had an exclusively national or territorial focus that allowed each country to distribute the assets located in that country to local creditors in accordance with its local laws. Universalism is a theory that posits that the bankruptcy law to be applied should be that of the debtor's home jurisdiction, that all of the assets of the insolvent corporation, in whichever country they are situated, should be pooled together and administered by the court of the home country. Local courts in other countries would be expected, under universalism, to recognize and enforce the judgment of the home country's court. This theory of universalism has not taken hold.

11 There is increasingly a move towards what has been called modified universalism. The notion of modified universalism is court recognition of main proceedings in one jurisdiction and non-main proceedings in other jurisdictions, representing some compromise of state sovereignty under domestic proceedings to advance international comity and cooperation. It has been advanced by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Model Law on Cross Border Insolvency, which Canada largely adopted by 2009 amendments to the CCAA and the BIA.¹ Before this amendment, Canada had gone far down the road in acting on comity principles in international insolvency. See *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re* (2000), 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and *Lear Canada, Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

12 In the BIA, the Model Law was introduced by the enactment of Part XIII. Section 267 sets out the policy objectives of Part XIII as follows:

The purpose of this Part is to provide mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvencies and to promote

(a) cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities in Canada with those of foreign jurisdictions in cases of cross-border insolvencies;

(b) greater legal certainty for trade and investment;

(c) the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects the interests of creditors and other interested persons, and those of debtors;

(d) the protection and the maximization of the value of debtors' property; and

(e) the rescue of financially troubled businesses to protect investment and preserve employment.

(a) Recognition of foreign proceeding

13 Section 269(1) of the BIA provides for the application by a foreign representative to recognize a foreign proceeding. Pursuant to section 270(1) of the BIA, the court shall make an order recognizing the foreign proceeding if (i) the proceeding is a foreign proceeding and (ii) the applicant is a foreign representative of that proceeding.

14 A foreign proceeding is broadly defined in section 268(1) to mean a judicial or an administrative proceeding in a jurisdiction outside Canada dealing with creditor's collective interests generally under any law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency in which a debtor's property and affairs are subject to control or supervision by a foreign court for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation.

15 The Japan bankruptcy proceeding is a judicial proceeding dealing with creditors' collective interests generally under the Japan Bankruptcy Act, which is a law relating to bankruptcy and insolvency, in which MtGox's property is subject to supervision by the Tokyo District Court, Twentieth Civil Division. As such, the Japan bankruptcy proceeding is a foreign proceeding pursuant to section 268(1) of the BIA.

16 Section 268(1) of the BIA defines a foreign representative as a person or body who is authorized in a foreign proceeding in respect of a debtor company to (a) administer the debtor's property or affairs for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation or (b) act as a representative in respect of the foreign proceeding.

17 The Trustee has authority, pursuant to the Japan Bankruptcy Act and the bankruptcy order made by the Tokyo District Court in the Japan bankruptcy proceeding, to administer MtGox's property and affairs for the purpose of liquidation and to act as a foreign representative. Thus the Trustee is a foreign representative pursuant to section 268(1) of the BIA.

18 In the circumstances it is appropriate to recognize the Japan bankruptcy proceeding as a foreign proceeding.

TAB 4

2019 ONSC 3238

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Hollander Sleep Products, LLC et al., Re

2019 CarswellOnt 8720, 2019 ONSC 3238, 307 A.C.W.S. (3d) 462, 72 C.B.R. (6th) 140

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

AND IN THE MATTER OF HOLLANDER SLEEP PRODUCTS, LLC, HOLLANDER
SLEEP PRODUCTS CANADA LIMITED, DREAM II HOLDINGS, LLC, HOLLANDER
HOME FASHIONS HOLDINGS, LLC, PACIFIC COAST FEATHER, LLC, HOLLANDER
SLEEP PRODUCTS KENTUCKY, LLC, AND PACIFIC COAST FEATHER CUSHION, LLC

APPLICATION OF HOLLANDER SLEEP PRODUCTS, LLC UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE
COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

Hainey J.

Heard: May 23, 2019

Judgment: May 30, 2019

Docket: CV-19-620484-00CL

Counsel: Shawn Irving, Marc Wasserman, for Applicant

Virginie Gauthier, for KSV Kofman Inc.

L. Joseph Latham, for Wells Fargo

Milly Chow, Kelly Bourassa, for Barings Finance LLC

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency; International

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Miscellaneous Company manufactured bedding products — Company had US and Canadian offices, with registered head office in Vancouver — Canadian branch was not profitable — Company sought restructuring as due to outstanding indebtedness and limited access to credit, it was facing severe liquidity constraints — Company brought application for several orders pursuant to [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#) including Ch. 11 cases — Ruling was made — Chapter 11 cases, pursuant to US Bankruptcy Code was foreign proceedings for Canadian purposes — Company was appointed foreign representative by US courts in Ch. 11 cases — Company's centre of main interests (COMI) was in United States, which meant that COMI of all Ch. 11 debtors was in United States — Therefore Ch. 11 cases were recognized as foreign main proceedings — Stay of proceedings was necessary in order to implement proposed restructuring — First day order were recognized as Canadian and US operations of company were highly integrated — DIP order was approved.

RULING with respect to procedure under creditors' restructuring legislation including proceedings commenced under US bankruptcy laws.

Hainey J.:

BACKGROUND

- b) Managerial functions for Hollander Canada, including finance, buying, logistics, marketing, and strategic decisions, are provided from Hollander's U.S. head office by Hollander Sleep Products;
- c) Hollander Canada is almost wholly dependent on Hollander's U.S. office for administrative functions such as overhead services, accounting, and IT, which are provided by Hollander Sleep Products in the U.S.;
- d) Data for Hollander Canada's operations is housed within IT systems, located and operated out of the U.S.;
- e) Hollander Canada is reliant on the purchasing power and supplier relationships of the Hollander enterprise, and on its own could not replicate the supply arrangements necessary for its continued functioning;
- f) Hollander Canada's books and records are maintained at Hollander's head office in Boca Raton, Florida;
- g) All of Hollander Canada's directors reside in the United States;
- h) Canadian revenues make up only 10.7% of Hollander's revenues;
- i) Hollander Canada is entirely dependent on the U.S. Chapter 11 Debtors for the majority of licensing agreements, design partnerships, and company-owned brands;
- j) Substantially all of the trademarks and intellectual property relied on by Hollander Canada are owned by the U.S. Chapter 11 Debtors;
- k) The Chapter 11 Debtors, including Hollander Canada, operate an integrated, centralized cash management system; and
- l) Hollander Canada is dependent on the U.S. Chapter 11 Debtors for the establishment, maintenance, and administration of certain customer promotional programs involving Hollander Canada's key customers.

36 Since all the Chapter 11 Debtors except Hollander Canada have registered offices in the United States, and since a review of Hollander Canada's business indicates that its COMI is in the United States, The COMI of all the Chapter 11 Debtors is in the United States and therefore the Chapter 11 Cases should be recognized as "foreign main proceedings".

SHOULD THE INITIAL RECOGNITION ORDER AND SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER BE GRANTED?

Is a Stay of Proceedings Required and Appropriate?

37 Section 48(1) of the CCAA provides that once the Court has found that a foreign proceeding is a "foreign main proceeding", it is required to grant certain mandatory relief, including a stay of proceedings:

38 In addition to the automatic relief provided for in s. 48, s.49 of the CCAA grants me the broad discretion to make any appropriate order if I am satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of creditors.

39 Section 52(1) of the CCAA requires that if an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the Court "shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding."

40 Because of the circumstances facing Hollander, Hollander Canada and the other Chapter 11 Debtors, I am satisfied that a stay of proceedings is necessary in order to implement the proposed restructuring.

Should the First Day Orders be Recognized?

41 The central principle governing Part IV of the CCAA is comity, which mandates that Canadian courts should recognize and enforce the judicial acts of other jurisdictions, provided that those other jurisdictions have assumed jurisdiction on a basis consistent with principles of order, predictability and fairness.

42 Canadian courts have emphasized the importance of comity and cooperation in cross-border insolvency proceedings to avoid multiple proceedings, inconsistent judgments and general uncertainty. Coordination of international insolvency proceedings is particularly critical in ensuring the equal and fair treatment of creditors regardless of their location.

43 I am satisfied that the First Day Orders should be recognized for the following reasons:

- a) The U.S. Court has appropriately taken jurisdiction over the Chapter 11 Cases, so comity will be furthered by this Court's recognition of and support for the Chapter 11 Cases already under way in the United States;
- b) Coordination of proceedings in the two jurisdictions will ensure equal and fair treatment of all stakeholders, whether they are in the United States or Canada;
- c) Given the close connection between Hollander and the United States, it is reasonable and sensible for the U.S. Court to have principal control over the insolvency process. This will produce the most efficient restructuring for the benefit of all stakeholders;
- d) The Chapter 11 Debtors must act quickly because of the expeditious timetable established under the Plan for their restructuring. It is imperative that there be a centralized and co-ordinated process for these insolvency proceedings to maximize the prospect of a successful restructuring and preserve value for stakeholders; and
- e) The Canadian and U.S. operations of Hollander are highly integrated.

Should the DIP ABL Charge be Granted?

44 The Chapter 11 Debtors are facing a liquidity crisis and require DIP financing to fund their operations while they pursue a restructuring pursuant to the Plan or a sale in accordance with the marketing process to be conducted as part of the Chapter 11 proceeding. The ability of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including Hollander Canada, to maintain and finance their operations requires working capital from the DIP Facilities. If interim financing through the DIP Facilities is not obtained, neither the Chapter 11 Debtors as a whole, nor Hollander Canada on a standalone basis, have the funds to finance going-concern operations.

45 The DIP ABL Facility includes an initial creeping roll-up provision pursuant to which the Chapter 11 Debtors will use receipts from their operations to pay down pre-filing obligations pending the issuance of the Final DIP Order. The amount borrowed under the DIP ABL Facility is proposed to be secured by, among other things, a court-ordered charge on Hollander Canada's property and the property of the other Chapter 11 Debtors in Canada (the "DIP ABL Charge").

46 This court has concluded in previous proceedings that there is no impediment to granting approval of interim DIP financing including a full roll-up provision in foreign recognition proceedings under Part IV of the CCAA³.

47 In *Hartford*, an application under Part IV of the CCAA, this court recognized a DIP facility authorized by the U.S. Court that included a full roll-up, and emphasized the importance of comity in foreign recognition proceeding as follows:

The Information Officer and Chapter 11 Debtors recognize that in CCAA proceedings, a partial "roll up" provision would not be permissible as a result of s.11.2 of the CCAA, which expressly provides that a DIP charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the Initial Order is made.

Section 49 of the CCAA provides that, in recognizing an order of a foreign court, the court may make any order that it considers appropriate, provided the court is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of the creditor or creditors.

It is necessary, in my view, to emphasize that this is a motion to recognize an order made in the "foreign main proceeding"

TAB 5

2019 ONSC 7042

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Purdue Pharma L.P., Re.

2019 CarswellOnt 21242, 2019 ONSC 7042, 313 A.C.W.S. (3d) 467, 76 C.B.R. (6th) 308

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 AS AMENDED**

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF AND IN THE MATTER OF PURDUE PHARMA L.P., PURDUE PHARMA INC., RHODES ASSOCIATES L.P., PAUL LAND INC., RHODES TECHNOLOGIES, RHODES PHARMACEUTICALS L.P., UDF LP, SVC PHARMA INC., BUTTON LAND L.P., SVC PHARMA LP, QUIDNICK LAND L.P., SEVEN SEAS HILL CORP., OPHIR GREEN CORP., PURDUE PHARMA OF PUERTO RICO, AVRIO HEALTH L.P., PURDUE TRANSDERMAL TECHNOLOGIES L.P., PURDUE PHARMACEUTICALS L.P., PURDUE PHARMA MANUFACTURING L.P., ALDON THERAPEUTICS L.P., IMBRIUM THERAPEUTICS L.P., GREENFIELD BIOVENTURES L.P., NAYATT COVE LIFESCIENCE INC., PURDUE NEUROSCIENCE COMPANY, PURDUE PHARMACEUTICALS PRODUCTS L.P.

Hainey J.

Heard: November 28, 2019

Judgment: December 30, 2019

Docket: CV-19-00627656-00CL

Counsel: David Byers, Ashley Taylor, Lee Nicholson, for Foreign Representative

Grant Moffat, Reidar Mogerman, for Province of British Columbia

Alex MacFarlane, Cindy Clark, for Purdue Pharma Inc., as the General Partner of Purdue Pharma Limited Partnership (Ontario) and Purdue Pharma Limited Partnership (Ontario)

David Bish, for Ernst & Young, Information Officer

Raymond Slattery, for Directors and Officers

Natalie Renner, for McKesson Canada Corporation and McKesson Corporation

Mark Meland, Avram Fishman, Tina Silverstein, for Quebec Class Action Plaintiff, Riccardo Camarda

Jonathan Liss, Nadia Campion, for Sackler Family

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency; International

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Practice and procedure in courts — Stay of proceedings

P Inc., in its capacity as foreign representative of itself, and 23 other debtors in possession, moved for order recognizing and enforcing U.S. Preliminary Injunction Order in Canada, and granting stay of proceedings in favour of certain related parties in Canada — Motion granted — At this early stage in proceedings, court should not allow single stakeholder to frustrate collective process that may benefit much larger group of stakeholders — Excluding Quebec Plaintiff from Related Party Stay Order would do just that.

MOTION by P Inc., in its capacity as foreign representative of itself, and 23 other debtors in possession, for order recognizing and enforcing U.S. Preliminary Injunction Order in Canada, and granting stay of proceedings in favour of certain related parties in Canada.

Hainey J.:

Overview

Analysis

19 The motion seeking the Related Party Stay Order is unopposed by all parties in Canada except the Quebec Plaintiff. I am satisfied that I should grant the order with respect to the other actions in Canada to support the Bankruptcy Court's primary goal of achieving a global resolution of all of the opioid-related claims. The only issue that I must decide is whether I should exclude the Quebec Plaintiff from the order.

20 Despite counsel for the Quebec Plaintiff's able argument, I have concluded that I should grant the Related Party Stay Order sought by the Foreign Representative and not exclude the Quebec Opioid Class Action from that order for the following reasons.

21 The principles of comity, cooperation and accommodation with foreign courts guide *CCAA* courts in cross-border insolvency cases. Section 52(1) of the *CCAA* provides as follows:

52(1) If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

22 Section 49(1) of the *CCAA* clearly provides me with jurisdiction to make the Related Party Stay Order if I am satisfied that it is necessary for the "protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of a creditor or creditors". I am satisfied that the order is necessary for this reason.

23 It is clear to me that the Bankruptcy Court intended to pause all of the opioid-related litigation against Purdue, the Chapter 11 Debtors and the Related Parties so that they could pursue a global resolution of all claims in the interests of all stakeholders. Following a full day hearing the Bankruptcy Court concluded that the Chapter 11 Debtors had satisfied the "extraordinary burden" for a stay of proceedings against the Related Parties in the United States. In granting the stay of proceedings the Bankruptcy Court stated as follows:

But again, this is a limited preliminary injunction. I believe that while I certainly respect the objecting states' interest in laying out the facts and in ultimate determination and in information sharing, I believe that interest here is outweighed on a preliminary basis by the benefits to all the parties to this case who are creditors in pursuing an overall reorganization that I would hope would include reasonable and lasting and binding, as I believe only a bankruptcy plan can bind the parties to, means to use the resources of these Debtors for the maximum benefit to the states, communities and individuals who the Debtors acknowledge have suffered from the opioid crisis.

24 The Related Party Stay Order sought by the Foreign Representative is intended to accomplish the same purpose as the Preliminary Injunction granted by the Bankruptcy Court in the U.S. The stay of proceedings against the Related Parties in Canada will temporarily pause the existing litigation here to allow stakeholders to focus on a global resolution. If I do not grant the stay of proceedings in Canada, Canadian creditors will have an advantage over U.S. creditors by continuing to pursue their actions against Related Parties here while U.S. claimants are at a standstill. This will result in an uneven playing field among stakeholders which is exactly what a stay of proceedings against third parties is intended to prevent. In order to cooperate to the maximum extent possible with the Bankruptcy Court I have concluded that I must grant the Related Party Stay Order with respect to all opioid-related actions in Canada, including the Quebec Opioid Class Action.

25 I agree with the Foreign Representative's submission that at this early stage in these proceedings I should not allow a single stakeholder to frustrate a collective process that may benefit a much larger group of stakeholders. In my view, excluding the Quebec Plaintiff from the Related Party Stay Order would do just that.

26 I do not accept the Quebec Plaintiff's submission that the Quebec Purdue Defendants are not Related Parties within the meaning of the Chapter 11 Proceedings. In the Chapter 11 Complaint a Related Party is defined to include "associated entities of the Debtors". The Quebec Purdue Defendants are clearly associated entities of the Chapter 11 Debtors through their common ownership.

TAB 6

2017 ONSC 673

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2017 CarswellOnt 1122, 2017 ONSC 673, 275 A.C.W.S. (3d) 696, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 289

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. c-36, AS AMENDED**

IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF NORTEL NETWORKS
CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION, NORTEL
NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION and NORTEL NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION

Newbould J.

Heard: January 12, 2017

Judgment: January 27, 2017

Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Jessica A. Kimmel for Monitor

Susan Philpott for Former Nortel employees

Lily Harmer for Superintendent of Financial Services as Administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund

Byron Shaw for Administrator of the Nortel Networks Managerial and NonNegotiated Pension Plan and Nortel Networks
Negotiated Pension Plan

Thomas McRae for Nortel Canadian continuing employees

Michael E. Barrack, D.J Miller for Nortel Networks UK Pension Trust Limited and Board of the Pension Protection Fund

Adam Slavens for Nortel Networks Inc.

Michael Wunder for Unsecured Creditors Committee

Gavin H. Finlayson, Amanda C. McLachlan for Ad Hoc Group of Bondholders

Matthew-Milne Smith for EMEA Debtors

John Salmas for Indenture Trustee, Wilmington Trust, N.A.

Subject: Insolvency

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Monitor

Passing accounts — Telecommunications company N, which had over 140 corporate entities in 60 jurisdictions, became insolvent — Canadian N debtors filed for [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#) protection in 2009 — Monitor was twice granted extraordinary expanded powers, resulting in Monitor and its counsel undertaking significantly greater scope of work than in typical [CCAA](#) case — In 2017, Monitor of Canadian debtors brought motion for order passing its accounts in amount of CA\$122,972,821.96, accounts of its Canadian legal counsel in amount of CA\$99,994,744.85, and accounts of its U.S. legal counsel in amount of \$31,352,136.73, incurred between 2009 to 2016 — Motion granted — Accounts approved — Monitor's duties were far more complex than normal due to matrix way in which N's business was operated — Extensive joint discovery process to resolve claims played large role in costs getting out of hand, and was not fault of Monitor — Monitor and counsel tried to be as efficient as possible in difficult circumstances and overall achieved very favourable outcomes for Canadian creditors — Proceedings were unprecedented in terms of size, complexity, international aspects and vast number of competing interests — Nature, extent and value of assets realized for creditors was significant — Billings over relevant period comprised combined total of 384,652.6 professional hours — Monitor and counsel's professional rates and disbursements were reasonable.

MOTION by monitor of insolvent company for passing of accounts of monitor and its counsel incurred during *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* proceedings.

Newbould J.:

Introduction

1 Ernst & Young Inc. in its capacity as Monitor of Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks Technology Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation, Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Communications Inc., Architel Systems Corporation and Northern Telecom Canada Limited (collectively, the "Canadian Debtors"), moves for an order passing the accounts of the Monitor and of its counsel incurred during the period January 14, 2009, the date these CCAA proceedings were commenced, through to and including May 31, 2016.

2 The background to this sorry saga has been described in a number of decisions.¹

3 At the time of the filing under the CCAA, Nortel consisted of more than 140 separate corporate entities located in 60 separate sovereign jurisdictions including Canada, the United States and the EMEA² region, as well as the Caribbean and Latin America and Asia. NNC, the Nortel Group's ultimate parent holding company, was publicly listed and traded on both the Toronto Stock Exchange and the New York Stock Exchange.

4 On January 14, 2009 NNC, NNL, the wholly owned subsidiary of NNC which was its operating subsidiary and a number of other Canadian corporations filed for protection under the CCAA. On the same date, Nortel Network Inc. ("NNI"), the principal US subsidiary of NNL, and a number of other US corporations filed for protection under chapter 11 of the US Bankruptcy Code and Nortel Networks UK Limited ("NNUK"), the principal UK subsidiary of NNL, and certain of their subsidiaries (the "EMEA Debtors") save the French subsidiary Nortel Networks S.A. ("NNSA") were granted administration orders under the UK Insolvency Act, 1986. On the following day, a liquidator of NNSA was appointed in France pursuant to Article 27 of the European Union's Council Regulation (EC) No 1346/2000 on Insolvency Proceedings in the Republic of France.

5 The Monitor was appointed in the Initial Order of January 14, 2009 which directed that "the Monitor and its legal counsel shall pass their accounts from time to time, and for this purpose the accounts of the Monitor and its legal counsel are hereby referred to a judge of the Commercial List of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice." It is normal in CCAA proceedings for the Monitor to pass its accounts periodically. This was no normal CCAA proceeding and the Monitor chose not to pass its accounts periodically but rather wait until the end of the proceedings. One advantage in having all of the accounts passed at this stage is that up to date information as to the level of success achieved by the Monitor, one of the key factors to be considered, is now available as a result of the settlement recently achieved in the allocation dispute.

6 Normally a Monitor performs a neutral role as a court officer in a CCAA proceeding. However in this case there were two orders giving the Monitor extraordinary powers. On August 10, 2009, Nortel announced the departure of its then CEO, Mike Zafirovski, and on the same day five members of NNC's and NNL's boards of directors resigned. As a result of this change in circumstances, on August 14, 2009, this Court granted an Order that expanded the Monitor's role and powers to include, *inter alia*, the ability:

(a) to conduct, supervise and direct the sales processes for the Canadian Debtors' property or business and any procedure regarding the allocation and/or distribution of proceeds of any sales;

(b) to cause the Canadian Debtors to exercise the various restructuring powers authorized under paragraph 11 of the Initial Order and to cause the Canadian Debtors to perform such other functions or duties as the Monitor considers necessary or desirable in order to facilitate or assist the Canadian Debtors in dealing with their property, operations, restructuring, wind-down, liquidation or other activities; and

concerns are ensuring that the monitor is fairly compensated while safeguarding the efficiency and integrity of the CCAA process. As with any inquiry, the evidence proffered will be important in making those determinations.

32 I am not aware of any reported authority supporting the proposition that there is a presumption of regularity that applies to a monitor's fees. This application is no different than any other. The applicant, here the Monitor, bears the onus of making out its case. A bald assertion by the Monitor that the Fee is reasonable does not necessarily make it so. The Monitor must provide the court with cogent evidence on which the court can base its assessment of whether the Fee is fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.

14 So far as the test for reviewing a receiver's fees is concerned, the New Brunswick Court of Appeal in *Belyea v. Federal Business Development Bank* (1983), 44 N.B.R. (2d) 248 (N.B. C.A.) referred to a number of factors to be considered. These factors have been accepted in Ontario as being a useful guideline but not an exhaustive list as other factors may be material in any particular case. See *Confectionately Yours Inc., Re* (2002), 36 C.B.R. (4th) 200 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 51 ("*Bakemates*") and *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer*, 2014 ONSC 365 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 5, aff'd, (2014), 20 C.B.R. (6th) 292 (Ont. C.A.). In *Diemer*, Pepall J.A. listed the factors as follows:

33 The court endorsed the factors applicable to receiver's compensation described by the New Brunswick Court of Appeal in *Belyea: Bakemates*, at para. 51. In *Belyea*, at para. 9, Stratton J.A. listed the following factors:

- the nature, extent and value of the assets;
- the complications and difficulties encountered;
- the degree of assistance provided by the debtor;
- the time spent;
- the receiver's knowledge, experience and skill;
- the diligence and thoroughness displayed;
- the responsibilities assumed;
- the results of the receiver's efforts; and
- the cost of comparable services when performed in a prudent and economical manner.

These factors constitute a useful guideline but are not exhaustive: *Bakemates*, at para. 51.

15 Justice Pepall further stated:

45 ... That said, in proceedings supervised by the court and particularly where the court is asked to give its imprimatur to the legal fees requested for counsel by its court officer, the court must ensure that the compensation sought is indeed fair and reasonable. In making this assessment, all the *Belyea* factors, including time spent, should be considered. However, value provided should pre-dominate over the mathematical calculation reflected in the hours times hourly rate equation. Ideally, the two should be synonymous, but that should not be the starting assumption. Thus, the factors identified in *Belyea* require a consideration of the overall value contributed by the receiver's counsel. The focus of the fair and reasonable assessment should be on what was accomplished, not on how much time it took. Of course, the measurement of accomplishment may include consideration of complications and difficulties encountered in the receivership.

16 As stated, The Bank of New York Mellon, as Indenture Trustee took the position that it is not possible based on the material filed by the Monitor to do an analysis required on a passing of accounts. It offered a suggestion that a practical solution is to refer the matter to a Master, an Assessment Officer or an outside expert. I do not agree with this suggestion. In my view

there is sufficient evidence to undertake a proper consideration of the accounts of the Monitor taking into account the factors to be considered in arriving at a fair and reasonable result.

17 The time and expense of referring the accounts to someone else would be very time consuming, create further expense and delay completion of this matter that has gone on far too long. The Initial Order directed the accounts to be passed by this Court. That makes sense, particularly as no other person has the familiarity of what has gone on in the Nortel insolvency as the Court has. These considerations have led other courts to decline to send the accounts out for review by others. See *Tepper Holdings Inc., Re* (2011), 381 N.B.R. (2d) 1 (N.B. T.D.) at para. 3; *Triton Tubular Components Corp., Re* (2006), 20 C.B.R. (5th) 278 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 83.

18 The Superintendent of Financial Services as administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund has been involved in these proceedings from the outset in January, 2009 and has been a member of the Canadian Only Creditors Committee (the "CCC"). The Superintendent supports the motion for an order passing the accounts of the Monitor and opposes the appointment of a special fee examiner to review the Monitor's accounts. It takes the position that his would create unnecessary and unwarranted additional expense and potential delay by virtue of the need to educate the examiner with respect to these hugely complex proceedings, particularly if the examiner was independent of the court with additional professional costs. The Superintendent further states that it is satisfied with a high level assessment of the Monitor's accounts in this case by this Court, given this Court's familiarity with many of the complexities of the proceedings, and by reference to the significantly higher costs incurred by the other Estates.

19 Morneau Shepell Ltd., was appointed the Administrator of the Nortel Networks Managerial and Non-Negotiated Pension Plan and the Nortel Networks Negotiated Pension Plan in October 2010 and has been actively involved in the CCAA restructuring process. It is one of the largest creditors of the Canadian Debtors. It takes the same position as the Superintendent regarding any attempt to have the accounts of the Monitor examined by some other party. It states that more litigation or court process in relation to the Monitor's accounts should be strongly discouraged and avoided. Far too much time and too much of the Canadian estate's resources have been consumed with seemingly endless litigation. More court process only delays, and may diminish, the distribution of assets available to creditors.

20 Michel E. Campbell is a former engineer employed by Nortel. Since the January 2009 CCAA filing, he has been heavily involved in the proceedings as a court-appointed representative of approximately 21,000 Nortel former employees, as an active member of the Nortel Retirees and Former Employees Protection Canada ("NRPC"), and as a claimant against the Nortel estate for the loss of severance and termination pay. He estimates that he has spent over 4,000 hours on issues in the proceedings relating to employee issues. As one of the former employees and as a court-appointed Representative, he has a financial stake in these proceedings. He too supports the passing of the Monitor's accounts and does not think a referral of the accounts to some third party is desirable. He states in his affidavit:

44. Moreover, given the volume and nature of the information provided in the Monitor's materials filed for this motion, and the fact that the fees as disclosed are subject to this Court's approval, I see no reason for another third party review or assessment. In any event, such a third party review would create more expense and delay in these proceedings, and would likely further postpone approval of the Plan of Arrangement and distributions on claims, which is far from desirable. The Former Employees have been waiting now for almost eight years to receive some payment for their losses. Further, it would be difficult for a third party who lacks background knowledge of this case to conduct a reliable, meaningful or accurate assessment of the Monitor's fees without the expenditure of considerable additional time and resources of the Monitor to provide information to the third party reviewer. This Court is by far the more appropriate arbiter of the Monitor's fees.

21 This case requires an overall assessment of the work done and a consideration of the results achieved. A line by line particularization of each particular job and each particular invoice would involve no doubt hundreds of thousands of dollars, taken the amount of activity and time involved in various matters. As well, in this case it is by no means the case that each task was discrete and could easily be separated out. As was stated by Justice Pepall, the value provided should pre-dominate the consideration of what a fair and reasonable amount is appropriate. A detailed assessment in this case would not be practical or serve that purpose.